

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,684	11/20/2003	Hai H. Trieu	4002-3269/PC775.00	9315
7590 07/02/2008 Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP			EXAMINER	
Bank One Center/Tower Suite 3700 111 Monument Circle Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137			SNOW, BRUCE EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/717.684 TRIEU, HAI H. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Bruce E. Snow 3738 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2008. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-34.72 and 73 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-5.18.28.29.31.32 and 34 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1, 2, 6-17, 19-27, 30, 33, 34, 72, 73 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______.

6) Other:

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

The Examiner reminds applicant of their elected species 1, figure 1. It is the Examiner's position that elected species, indicated as expandable device 30, is also shown as expandable device 30 in figure 4B. The Examiner notes that the elected embodiment is cylindrical as shown. The specification states:

Figs. 4A and 4B are a plan view and an elevation view, respectively, with the collapsed expandable device and delivery instrument of Fig. 1 in section and positioned in the prepared locations of the spinal column segment.

It is the Examiner's position that the elected embodiment is not generic to all the other embodiments such as Figure 33 (indicated as a patentably distinct species in the species requirement dated 6/21/06).

Regarding claims 18 and 34, applicant indicated that "degrading the load support element" is found on page 21 of the specification which is direction to a non-elected species; thus, the claims has been withdrawn to a non-elected species.

Regarding the restriction requirement dated 3/25/08:

Applicant's election with traverse of "motion preserving device" in the reply filed on 4/25/08 is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that a fusion device and a motion preserving device are classified the same. This is not found persuasive because the statement is false. Fusion device are correctly classified in 623/17.11 whereas, motion preserving

Art Unit: 3738

device are in 623/17.12-17.16. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAI

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments and amendments filed 8/13/07 have been fully considered. Applicant's "Election Requirement Should be Withdrawn" section is noted, however, the restriction was made final in the Office action dated 5/11/07.

Regarding the rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, claims 18 and 34, "degrading the load support element" is not understood. Applicant directed indicated support in page 21 of the specification which is direction to a non-elected species. The claims have been withdrawn.

Applicant's amendments and arguments regarding Bao et al (7,077,865) rejections are persuasive.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being <u>clearly</u> anticipated by Teitelbaum et al (6,582,467), applicant argued that claim 1 requires a motion preserving device which is persuasive. However, applicant failed to provide any arguments why claim 19 is patentable over Teitelbaum et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 3738

All claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1 and 19, the elected embodiment shown in figures 1 and 4A is not capable of being an expandable motion preserving device. The specification does not enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the elected device as claimed.

Claim 1, "said expandable element being a balloon and said expanding including inflating said balloon with fluid; deflating said balloon and removing said balloon from said expandable device and said disc space" is new matter.

As far as the scope of the claims can be determined, the following is made of record

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English lanuage.

Art Unit: 3738

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 19-27, 30, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being <u>clearly</u> anticipated by Teitelbaum et al (6,582,467).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3738

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruce E. Snow whose telephone number is (571) 272-4759. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 7

Art Unit: 3738

/Bruce E Snow/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3738